

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

1

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/903,606	07/13/2001	Odile Aubrun-Sonneville	210237US0	2212
22850	7590 02/07/2005		EXAM	INER
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			YU, GINA C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1617	

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	09/903,606	AUBRUN-SONNEVILLE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Gina C. Yu	1617			
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address			
Period for Reply  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by si Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	ON. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re. r. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely.  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	11 December 2004				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
<ul> <li>4)</li></ul>	drawn from consideration.  8 is/are rejected.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to the drawing (s) be held in abeyan trection is required if the drawing (	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docum application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received.  Itents have been received in Appriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

Application/Control Number: 09/903,606 Page 2

Art Unit: 1617

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The receipt is acknowledged of amendment and declaration filed on December 1, 2004. The finality of the Office action dated July 1, 2004 is hereby withdrawn as the rejections made under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) are withdrawn in view of applicants' remarks and the declaration. New rejections are now made in view of new prior arts. Claims 1-13 and 15-48 are pending.

#### Oath/Declaration

Declaration filed under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 on December 1, 2004 was fully considered. The declaration, along with English translation of laboratory notes in French, indicates that applicants had reduced to practice the claimed invention prior to May 29, 2000 and after January 1, 1996. The earliest date of the presentation of Proceedings (5<sup>th</sup> World Surfactants Congress) is on May 29, 2000. The rejection made under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) over Aronson et al. (US 4,606,913) in view of Proceedings is withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 8, 12, 13, 15-20, 22, 23, 29, 31-33, 35-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lachampt et al. (US 3846546) ("Lachampt").

Lachampt discloses cosmetic water-in-oil emulsion comprising emulsions stabilization agent which is prepared by copolymerization of an alpha-olefin having 10-20 carbon atoms (apolar monomer) and dicarboxylic anhydrides (polar component). See col. 3, lines 22-41. See instant claims 1, 16, 19, 31-33, and 39. The reference teaches alpha-olefin of 1-decene, 1-dodecene, 1-tetradecene, 1-hexadecene, 1octadece and 1-eicosene. See ld; instant claim 3. The reference also discloses dicarboxylic anhydrides including maleic anhydride, itaconic anhydride, and citraconic anhydride. See instant claims 5, 6, and 8. Example 2 discloses a water-in-oil emulsion comprising 56 % by weight of water and hydrocarbon oils (petroleum jelly, paraffin oil, isopropyl palmitate, lanoline, microcrystalline wax) which make up at least 40 % of the oily phase. See also Examples 3-20; col. 4, lines 24 – 34. See instant claims 12, 13, 15, 29, 31-33, 35, 36. The method of using the composition to treat skin is an inherent use of the moisturizing cream. See instant claims 17, 18. Since the molecular weight of the 50% 1-octadecene/50% maleic anhydride copolymer is 18,000, and the molecular weight of 1-octadecene is 252 g/mol and maleic anhydride, 98 g/mol, the copolymer has about 51 moles of the olefin, and thus meets the limitation of "polyolefinic apolar component comprising at least 40 carbon atoms". See instant claims 1, 2, 16, 19, and 39. Example 2 contains 1.3 % by weight of the copolymer, meeting instant claims 11, 40-45. The method of making the emulsion is also taught in the Examples. See instant claims 19 and 20. Example 2 contains isopropyl palmitate, which is fatty acid ester of straight fatty acid of 15 carbon atoms, meets instant claim 22 and 23. The term "makeup removing" refers to future intended use or purpose of the composition, and will not

be given any patentable weight. Nevertheless, Example 13 exemplifies a moisturizing "remover cream" which comprises isopropyl palmitate.

While the reference does not refer the polymer as an "emulsifier" the limitation is met since the prior art discloses the same compound. The property of the polymer to reduce the interfacial tension between the aqueous phase and the oily phase of the emulsion as recited in instant claim 4 is an inherent property of the prior art polymers.

Claims 1-6, 8, 12, 13, 15-20, 29, 31-33, 35-39, and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Viout et al. (US 3860700) ("Viout").

Viout discloses cosmetic water-in-oil emulsions comprising copolymer formed from an unsaturated dicarboxylic acid anhydride (polar component) and unsaturated monomer having alpha-olefins having 10-20 carbon atoms having a MW of 4000-100,000. See Examples 1-8; col. 3, lines 2 – 18. See instant claims 31-33. The reference discloses dicarboxylic anhydrides including maleic anhydride, itaconic anhydride, and citraconic anhydride. See col. 3, lines 2 – 13; see instant claims 5, 6, and 8. The reference teaches alpha-olefin of 1-decene, 1-dodecene, 1-tetradecene, 1-hexadecene, 1-octadece and 1-eicosene. See col. 3, lines 30-38; instant claim 3. The method of making water-in-oil emulsion by adding the copolymer in an oil to be emulsified and then adding a suitable amount of water is taught in Examples. See instant claims 19-20. Example E discloses a water-in-oil emulsion comprising 35 % by weight of water and hydrocarbon oils (paraffin oil) which make up at least 40 % of the oily phase. See also Examples A-N. See instant claims 12, 13, 15. The method of using the composition to treat skin is an inherent use of the moisturizing cream. See

Page 5

instant claims 17, 18. Since the molecular weight of the 50% 1-eicosene /50% maleic anhydride copolymer used in Example E is 20,000, and the molecular weight of 1-octadecene is 280 g/mol and maleic anhydride, 98 g/mol, the copolymer has about 53 moles of the olefin, and thus meets the limitation of "polyolefinic apolar component comprising at least 40 carbon atoms". See instant claims 1, 2, 16, 19, and 39. The method of making the emulsion is also taught in the Examples. See instant claims 19 and 20.

Claims 46-48 are met since the copolymer is the only emulsifying component in the composition. The property of the polymer to reduce the interfacial tension between the aqueous phase and the oily phase of the emulsion as recited in instant claim 4 is an inherent property of the prior art polymers.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lachampt as applied to claims 1-6, 8, 12, 13, 15-20, 22, 23, 29, 31-33, 35-45 or Viout as applied to claims 1-6, 8, 12, 13, 15-20, 29, 31-33, 35-39, and 46-48, and further in view of Knowlton (Poucher's Perfumes, Cosmetics and Soaps, Emulsion Theory).

Lachampt and Viout fail to teach water-in-oil-in water or oil-in-water-in-oil emulsions.

Knowlton teaches that many emulsions in cosmetic art are in complex structure of W/O/W or O/W/O emulsions. See p. 535, first full par. The reference teaches, "classification of emulsions into two types, each having two discreet phases", is simplistic. A deeper examination of emulsion systems reveals other phases apart from 'oil' and 'water' and included amongst these is the 'emulsifier phase' itself and the existence of liquid crystals." See Id.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the emulsions of Lachampt or Viout are in fact W/O/W or O/W/O emulsions as taught by Knowlton because the latter teaches that a two-phase emulsion in fact leads to the formation of multiphase systems.

Claims 24, 25, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lachampt as applied to claims 1-6, 8, 12, 13, 15-20, 22, 23, 29, 31-33, 35-45 or Viout as applied to claims 1-6, 8, 12, 13, 15-20, 29, 31-33, 35-39, and 46-48, and further in view of Aronson et al. (US 4,606,913) ("Aronson").

The references fail to teach at least 80 % by weight of aqueous phase.

Aronson et al. is directed to high-internal phase emulsions wherein the emulsion is water-in-oil. See col. 5, lines 28-29. For hydrocarbon oils see column 6, lines 40- The amount of oily phase in water-in-oil emulsions is about 2-24% by volume (col. 6, lines 57-68). The amount of aqueous phase in water-in-oil emulsions is usually about 76-98% by volume (col. 7, lines 7-13). The reference teaches the method of making stable high internal phase emulsions less costly. See col. 3, lines 19 – 31, col. 5, lines 16 – 31.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the composition of the Lachampt or Viout by making high internal phase emulsion as motivated by Aronson because the latter teaches that the high internal phase emulsions made according to the invention are less costly and stable. There is a reasonable expectation of successfully making the claimed invention because all the references are directed to cosmetic emulsions with water and hydrocarbon oils.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7, 9-11, 30, and 34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 and 15-48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection in part, as discussed above.

#### Conclusion

Claims 1-6, 8, 12, 13, 15-29, 31-33, 35-48 are rejected.

Claims 7, 9-11, 30, and 34 are objected to.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gina C. Yu whose telephone number is 571-272-0635.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan can be reached on 571-272-0629. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 09/903,606 Page 8

**Art Unit: 1617** 

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gina Yu Patent Examiner

> SREENI PADMANABHAN SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER